

### REMARKS

Applicants' respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

A request for a three month extension of time and a Notice of Appeal were mailed to the USPTO on July 28, 2004 together with the requisite fees. In response to the final office action mailed on January 28, 2004, enclosed herewith is Amendment B and Transmittal of Drawing Correction with two sheets of corrected drawings and corresponding formal drawings therefor.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's recognition that claims 1-15 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the Rule 112 rejections.

Claims 1-5 and 9-12 have been amended. Claims 1-15 remain in the application.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a), asserting that the surfaces appear to be flat in the drawings as opposed to concave.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection in view of Applicant's amendment to the drawings. In Figures 2 and 14, the indicator line for numeral 31 has been shortened and an arrow added to indicate the entry portion or louver; indicator line for numeral 36 has been shortened to indicate the trailing edge of the louver; and additional curved lines have been added to better show the concave depressions of the louver. Figure 13 has been amended to show that the air passages may be drilled normal to the axis of the flange or at an angle thereto.

In addition the specification has been amended in order that the drawings and claims correspond to the figure numbers in the specification.

No new matter has been added to the drawings or specification which was not disclosed in the original specification or claims.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 12 under 35 USC §112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection in view of Applicant's amendment to claims 5 and 12. In addition, page 3, line 24 and page 4, lines 1-2 support Applicant's claim of an angled bore. The specification states: "Moreover, the apertures may include thorough bores angled forming louvers for funneling air there through."

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15 under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite:

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection in view of the amendment to claims 1-5 and 6-12, including both of the independent claims 1 and 9, and the following remarks.

The Examiner has objected to the use of the term "off center" in claims 1 and 9. Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to delete the phrase "off center".

The Examiner has objected to the reference to "a leading edge" and indicated the phrase was ambiguous with respect to the definition of the trailing edge. Applicant has amended the specification and claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

The Examiner has objected to the use of the term "air flow passage" in claim 2 alleging insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended the independent claim 1 upon which claim 2 depends in order to obtain the requisite antecedent basis.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the claims are patentable over the

cited references and that the application is in better condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests prompt reconsideration and receipt of the formal Notice of Allowance.

If the Examiner believes there are other unresolved issues in this case, Applicant's attorney would appreciate a telephone call at (502) 452-1233 to discuss any such remaining issues.

Please charge for any underpayment or credit and overpayments to Counsel's deposit account 50-0642.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Carrithers  
CARRITHERS LAW OFFICE, PLLC  
One Paragon Centre  
6060 Dutchman's Lane, Suite 140  
Louisville, KY 40205  
Telephone (502) 452-1233  
Reg. No. 35,475